Doc		JUL 0 5 2005 U.S. Patent and	Taudamade (2006	PTO/SE/21 (09.04) use (hrough 97/31/2006, OMR 0551-0031 cc; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE	
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no	persons are required	Application Number		751,585	
TRANSMITTAL FORM		Filing Date		12/29/2000 Eric T. Lambert et al.	
		First Named Inventor	Eric		
		Art Unit	362	7	
(to be used for all correspondence after initial faling)		Examiner Name	And	Andrew J. Rudy	
Total Number of Pages in This Submissio		Allomey Docket Num	nber YO	R920000560US1	
	ENCLOS	SURES (Check all tha	t apply)		
Fee Attached  Amendment / Reply  After Final  After Final  After Final  Extension of Time Request  Express Abandanment Request  Information Disclosure Statement  Contined Copy of Priority Document(s)  Rosponse to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application  Reply to Missing Parts und 37 GFR 1.52 or 1.53	Petition Petition Provisio Power of Change Termin Reque	g-related Papers		After Allowance Communication to TC  Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences  Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)  Proprietary Information  Status Letter  Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):	
		CANT, ATTORNEY, OR	AGENT		
Firm Name Cantor Colburn L					
Eignnturo Maris re	J. Juliuse	<u>.                                    </u>			
Printed name Marisa J. Dubne			Run No. 46		
Dato July 5, 2005	July 5, 2005			5,673	
	CERTIFICATE	OF TRANSMISSION	MAILING	3	
I heroby certify that this correspondence is sufficient postage as first class mail in an	boing facsimile tra envelope addresses	namitted to the USPTO or o d to: Commissioner for Pate	deposited with ents, P O. Bos	n the United States Postal Service with x 1450, Alexandria,VA 22313-1450 on the	
Signature Jusaic	ed Hus	ton			
Typod or printed namo Pessica L. Huston			Date	July 5, 2005	

This collection of intermation is required by 37 CFR 15. The information is required to obtain or retain a benufit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 36 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hears to complete, including gallering, preparing, and submitting two completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the inclipidual case. Any communits on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be inclipidual case. Any communits on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be the Chief Information Officer. U.S. Palent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT St ND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

# JUL-05-2005 TUE 02:32 PM CANTOR COLBURN LLP RECEIVED NO. 8602860115 CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 0 5 2005

P. 02/05
RECE:
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL L. ......

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

APPELLANT:	ERIC T. LAMBERT ET AL	) Group Art Unit: 3627
SERIAL NUMBER:	09/751,585	) Examiner: ) Andrew J. Rudy
FILEO:	December 29, 2000	)
FOR:	METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR ELECTRONICALLY QUALIFYING SUPPLIER PARTS	) Confirmation No. 8383

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

#### REPLY BRIEF

In response to the Examiner's Answer mailed May 5, 2005, the Applicants submit the following reply as follows:

#### ARGUMENT

### Rejection of Claims 40-71

The Examiner states, on page 4 of the Examiner's Answer dated May 5, 2005, that the Appellants' method claims do not use or manipulate any of the list of databases claimed. The Examiner further contends that the method for facilitating part qualification functions as recited in Appellants' claim 40 does not require the list of databases. In support, the Examiner relies upon Lincoln Engineering Co. v. Stewart-Warner Corp., 303 U.S. 545, 37 USPQ 1 (1938). However, the proposition that a rejection based upon an old combination, which in aggregation, perform or produce no new or different function or operation has been invalidated. "A claim should not be rejected on the ground of aggregation." In re Gustafson, 331 F.2d 905, 141 USPQ 585 (CCPA 1964). The statutory language is the only proper basis for an old combination rejection. In re Bernhardt, 417 F.2d 1395, 163 USPQ 611 (CCPA 1969). Accordingly, the Examiner's reliance upon the principle of "old combination" is in error.

Notwithstanding, the method recited in claim 40 does not recite limitations that are drawn to a structure rather than to a method, as indicated by the Examiner. The structural elements recited in claim 40 affect the method in a manipulative sense. In particular, claim 40 recites creating a commodity template for a commodity associated with a supplier part. The creating includes entering requirements data for qualifying the commodity and selecting at least one database in a part qualification repository for storing the requirements data. The databases includes parts database receiving information from a commercial parts database, a technology survey database, a quality information network database, an archives database, and a system testing database. Thus, commodity template is created and requirements data for qualifying the commodity are entered and stored in a selected database. The method includes assigning a default viewing tool for qualifying the commodity based upon the corresponding database selected, applying access restrictions associated with the commodity template, and sharing the requirements data among the databases. It is evident from the aforementioned application of

YOR920000560US1 127-0005 method steps to the corresponding structural elements that the structural elements appropriately affect the recited method in a manipulative sense and does not amount to the mere claiming of a use of particular structure as indicated by the Examiner.

The Examiner's Answer further acknowledges Appellants' traversal of the Official Notice taken with respect to the databases recited in Appellants claims. The Examiner submits as evidence U.S. Patent No. 6,813,777 issued to Weinberger. Upon a review of this reference, it appears that Weinberger is non-analogous art. Weinberger is directed to a transaction dispatcher for a passenger entertainment system and method. For at least this reason, the Appellants submit that it is inappropriate to rely on Weinberger to suggest that the databases recited in Appellants' claim 40 are common knowledge in the art as suggested by the Examiner.

For at least the reasons advanced above, the Appellants submit that claims 40-71 patentably define over Ferriter, Ensel, and Aycock.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is urged that the final rejection of claims 40-71 be overturned. The final rejection is in error and should be reversed. The fee set forth in 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2) is enclosed herewith. If there are any additional charges with respect to this Reply Brief, or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

ERIC T. LAMBERT ET AL

Marisa J. Dubud
Registration No. 46,673
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 48915

Date: July 5, 2005